U.S. Pat. App. Ser. No. 09/750,423 Attorney Docket No. 10191/1665 Communication (Substance of the Interview) As to 11/29/07 Notice of Allowance

REMARKS

On, 2007, Examiner Chen (571-272-3789) initiated phone calls with Aaron C. Deditch (reg. no. 33,865) to offer certain proposed amendments to the claims, and on March 13, 2007 the final proposed amendments as detailed in the Examiner's Amendment and Interview Summary were entered. In particular, claim 13 was amended as follows:

13. (Proposed Amended) A method of preventing a pirated copy of a computer program, comprising:

determining whether a dongle is connected to a computer;

checking whether the dongle contains a correct computer identifier when the dongle is connected to the computer;

copying a key to the dongle when the dongle contains the correct computer identifier, the key uniquely identifying a licensed copy of the computer program;

erasing the key in the computer from a first memory element of the computer if a transfer of the key to the dongle is successful so that a subsequent attempt to transfer the key to another computer does not result in a transfer of the key to the another computer unless the key has been transferred back to the computer from the dongle which received the key;

erasing the computer identifier in the dongle; and

preventing an execution of the computer program on the computer if the key is erased on the computer.

It is noted that the Interview Summary form that was used by the Examiner was PTOL-413, which states that Applicant is given one month from the Interview date (November 13, 2007) or one month from its mailing date (November 29, 2007), whichever is later.

However, since this was an Examiner initiated interview, it is respectfully submitted that PTOL-413B should have been used, and since the case was allowed, the first box of Part III of that form should have provided that Applicant did not need to provide a separate record of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the Application, and since the Examiner provided a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability (which was done here).

As explained above, the Examiner Amendment and Interview Summary is correct as to the fact that Applicants agreed to amend claim 13 as above to allow the case.

If Applicant had initiated the Interview (which was not the case), then PTOL-413 would have been the proper form to use.

The foregoing procedures are documented and explained in the M.P.E.P. At 713.04 (pages 700-182 to 700-186).

U.S. Pat. App. Ser. No. 09/750,423 Attorney Docket No. 10191/1665 Communication (Substance of the Interview) As to 11/29/07 Notice of Allowance

Since, however, the Examiner sent form PTOL-413, it is believed that this response satisfies the request for Applicant to file a Statement of the Substance of the Interview (see pages 700-184 and 700-185 of the M.P.E.P.).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowed in view of the Notice of Allowability. It is therefore respectfully requested that the present application issue promptly.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

Rv.

Gerard A. Messina

Keg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP

One Broadway

New York, New York 10004

(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO 26646